REMARKS

Claims 1-51 and 55-74 are pending. Claims 8, 15, 22, 31, 32, 35, 39, 44, 57, 60, 62, 67, 70 and 73 are amended by way of this Amendment to correct obvious typographical errors. No new matter is believed to be added. All claims 1-51 and 55-74, as amended, are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

The undersigned appreciates the time and consideration taken by the Examiner during the telephonic interview conducted with Jung-hua Kuo on July 15, 2004. Claims and the cited references were discussed.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 31, 35, 39 and 44 because of informalities. These claims are amended to correct the obvious typographical errors. Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 8, 15, 22, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. These claims are amended to correct the obvious typographical errors rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 15, 22, 32, 62, 67, 70 and 73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. These claims are amended to correct the obvious typographical errors. Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-31, 41-51, 67-70, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brint in view of Wong and Roach.

Independent claim 1 generally recites a headset with a memory for storing a preference setting that can be repeatedly modified and stored during use of the headset and a host adapter selectively coupled to the headset and capable of accessing the memory in order to read the

preference setting. One key advantage of configuring memory for storing preference settings in the headset itself and for selectively coupling to the host adapter is to allow a user to couple the headset to *any* host adapter without losing the user's stored preferences (as they are stored in the headset itself) and may be particularly suited for users in a call center. Each of independent claims 8, 15, 22, 41, 45, 49, and 67, as amended, recites an apparatus or a method with similar elements or features. As discussed below,

Brink in combination with Wong and Roach neither discloses nor renders obvious the inventions as claimed. Brint discloses a universal interface module 10 that interfaces with many different *types* of headsets 12. Each type of headset 12 corresponds to a particular pin configuration of the headset connector 20. Thus, different types of headsets have different pin configurations. Connecting or plugging the headset connector 20 into the host adapter 10 completes a circuit in the host adapter 10 so that the host adapter 10 will behave in a manner corresponding to the particular *type* of headset 12. For example, Brint discloses that an electrical contact pin element 32 connects to an electrical potential and completes a wired interconnection of the headset to the interface to provide the programming signal for the interface module 10. (See, e.g., col. 1, lines 46-48; claims 8 and 10). In other words, the interface module 10 is passively "programmed" for a particular type of headset depending on the specific pin configuration of the connecter 12. Brint is only concerned with modifying the interface module 10 for different *types* of headsets and not concerned with variations among headsets of the *same type*.

Once the interface module 10 of Brint is "programmed" using the electrical contact pins 32 for the particular type of headset, no further adjustments to the interface module 10 using the connector 20 should be made. The physical configuration of the electrical contact pin elements 32 of the connector 20 is designed into and thus predefined and permanently fixed for each type of headset 12, i.e., not subject to modification. Indeed, if the physical configuration of the pins 32 were modified, the headset 12 may not operate. Thus there is a lack of motivation to modify Brint with a memory that can store a preference setting that can be *repeatedly modified and stored during use of the headset*, as recited in the claims.

Wong, alone or in combination with Brint and/or Roach, also fails to provide motivation to modify Brint. In particular, Wong discloses a radio communication device 110 interfacing with multiple audio accessories 120, 130. Each of the accessories stores equalizer parameters that correspond to the potential impact that the accessory has on the processing of audio signals

by the radio 110 (col. 2, lines57-60). Wong addresses the issue of coupling unanticipated or unanticipated combinations of accessories to the radio device 110 (col. 1, lines 38-42) such that the radio device 110 need not anticipate all variations and combinations of accessories (col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 1; see also col. 1, lines 22-27). The equalizer parameters are not adjusted or modified once the desired equalizer parameters have been stored to the accessory memory. Thus, similar to Brint, Wong fails to suggest and fails to provide any motivation to modify Brint with a memory that can store a preference setting that can be *repeatedly modified and stored during use of the headset*, as recited in the claims.

Roach, alone or in combination with Brint and/or Wong, also fails to provide motivation or suggestion to modify Brint with a headset memory that can store a preference setting that can be repeatedly modified and stored during use of the headset, as recited in the claims. Roach discloses a headset base unit, i.e., a host adapter, that includes a memory to store user preferences.

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Roach stores the preference settings in the headset base unit 703, i.e. the host adapter, *not* in the headset 701 (FIG. 7). Roach's mention that the headset base unit 703 may be incorporated into the in the headphone 701 or in the telephone 706 (col. 7, lines 17-22) does not change the fact that it is the host adapter that has the memory for storing preference settings, not the headset. Thus, because Roach teaches configuration and storage of preference settings *stored in the host adapter*, Roach, in combination with Brint and/or Wong, also fails to provide motivation or suggestion to modify Brint with a memory in the headset that can store a preference setting, as recited in the claims.

Thus, the combination of Brint, Wong and Roach, without more, fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the combined teachings would not have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art the invention as claimed. In particular, Brint teaches using the pin configuration of a headset connector to identify the particular type of headset to a universal host adapter and Wong teaches an audio accessory storing equalizer parameters corresponding to the impact of the accessory on the audio signal processing by the radio communication device. Both Brint and Wong deal with the compatibility among different types of accessories/headsets in communication with a host adapter such that information stored in the accessory/headset *are not and should not be modified*. Thus Brint and Wong both teach away from providing a memory configured to be modified and adjusted.

Further, Roach teaches modifying and storing preference settings in the host adapter, i.e., both Brint and Roach store the particular preference settings in the host adapter itself, *not* in the headset. Roach also only stores preferences in the host adapter for use with a single type of headset. Even if the teachings of Roach and/or Wong were to be combined with Brint, the modified Brint headset would provide modifiable preference settings in its host adapter 10. Indeed, Brint clearly illustrates various user-configurable settings in the base unit 10 (FIG. 1).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-31, 41-51, 67-70, and 72 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brint in view of Wong. As discussed above, Brint in view of Wong fails to disclose or suggest a headset with a memory for storing a performance characteristic that can be repeatedly modified and stored during use of the headset and a host adapter selectively coupled to the memory and capable of accessing the memory in order to read the preference setting, as generally recited in independent claim 32.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 33-35 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brint in view of Wong and Hendrix. Claims 36 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brint in view of Wong and Hendrix and further in view of Roach. However, because the independent claims from which these claims depend are believed to be allowable over the cited references as discussed above, these claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same or similar reasons as set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 55 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauney in view of Widin and Gurne. Independent claim 55 generally recites storing a service date and type of service performed on the headset in the memory device, reading the service date and type of service from the memory by a host adapter *in selective communication* with the headset memory device, and repeating the storing and reading upon modification of the service date and type of service performed stored in the memory device.

In contrast, the combination of Mauney, Widin and Gurne, fails to discloses such elements. Mauney discloses a conventional headset base unit in cooperation with a headset. However, the combination of Mauney, Widin and Gurne does not disclose or suggest that the memory be incorporated into the headset and be selectively coupled to a host adapter. For example, the memory and the host adapter in Mauney are integrated into the conventional base unit as a single, inseparable unit. One key advantage of configuring the headset with memory (as generally recited in claim 55 for example) to be selectively coupled the host adapter is to allow a user to couple the headset to *any* host adapter without losing the data stored in the memory (as they are stored in the headset itself) and may be particularly suited for use in a call center.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 57-66 and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brint in view of Wong, Roach and Liebenow. Independent claim 57 generally recites storing a first and a second set of user defined preferences in a headset memory device configured to be *selectively coupled* to the host adapter capable of accessing the memory, retrieving and setting the host adapter using the first set of preferences from the memory when the headset is coupled to the host adapter and used by the first user, and retrieving and setting the host adapter using the second set of preferences when the headset is coupled to the host adapter and used by the second user.

Each of independent claims 57 and 63 recites a method or apparatus with a headset memory device selectively coupled on a host adapter for storing multiple sets of user defined preferences and setting the host adapter to a particular set of user defined preferences depending upon the headset being used by which user.

In contrast, Roach fails to disclose that the memory stored user defined preferences for multiple users. Upon recalibration of the headset, the first set of preferences would be overwritten. In addition, similar to the reasons set forth above, neither Brint nor Roach, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests certain elements, namely, headset memory device selectively coupled to a host adapter for storing multiple sets of user defined preferences and setting the host adapter to a particular set of user defined preferences depending upon which user is using the headset. As Liebenow also fails to disclose such elements, the addition of Liebenow does not make up for the deficiencies of the combination of Brint in view of Roach.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 57-66 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-2315 (Order No. 01-3569).

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Hsieh
Reg. No. 44,780

Plantronics, Inc.
345 Encinal Street
P.O. Box 635
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-0635
Telephone: (831) 458-7758
Facsimile: (831) 426-2965